UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,002	02/20/2004	Fuhwei Lwo	RSW920030291US1	7441

45541 7590 10/20/2008
HOFFMAN WARNICK LLC
75 STATE ST
14TH FLOOR
ALBANY, NY 12207

EXAMINER	
CHEN, QING	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2191	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/20/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOCommunications@hoffmanwarnick.com

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/783,002	**Applicant(s)** LWO, FUHWEI	
	Examiner Qing Chen	**Art Unit** 2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2008.

2a)□ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)□ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)□ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.

7)□ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)□ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)□ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)□ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)□ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)□ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)□ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:

1.□ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.□ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.□ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) □ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) □ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) □ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) □ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) □ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) □ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is in response to the RCE filed on August 4, 2008.

2. **Claims 1-27** are pending.

3. **Claims 1, 10, and 19** have been amended.

4. Applicant fails to address the objection to the abstract due to the use of an improper heading. Accordingly, this objection is maintained and further explained hereinafter.

5. Applicant fails to fully address the objection to the specification due to a typographical error. Accordingly, this objection is maintained and further explained hereinafter.

6. The 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejections of Claims 1-27 are maintained in view of Applicant's arguments and further explained hereinafter.

7. The 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections of Claims 10-18 are withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments to the claims.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

8. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 4, 2008 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

Specification

9. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the heading of the abstract should be "Abstract" or "Abstract of the Disclosure." See 37 CFR § 1.72(b).

10. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: All instances of "jar" should be changed to uppercase in paragraph [0033].

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

12. **Claims 1-27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 10, 12-15, 18, 19, 21-24, and 27 contain the trademark or trade name JAVA. When a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, the use of a trademark or trade name in a claim to identify or describe a material or product (in the present case, a specific programming language) would not only render a claim indefinite, but would also constitute an improper use of the trademark or trade name.

Claims 2, 7, and 8 depend on Claim 1 and, therefore, suffer the same deficiency as Claim 1.

Claims 11, 16, and 17 depend on Claim 10 and, therefore, suffer the same deficiency as Claim 10.

Claims 20, 25, and 26 depend on Claim 19 and, therefore, suffer the same deficiency as Claim 19.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. **Claims 1-6, 8, 10-15, 17, 19-24, and 26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **US 6,986,132 (hereinafter "Schwabe")** in view of **US 6,430,564 (hereinafter "Judge")**.

As per **Claim 1**, Schwabe discloses:

- receiving source input corresponding to a first release of Java™ byte code and target input corresponding to a second release of the Java™ byte code *(see Figure 20A: 1540 and 1550)*;

- transforming the source input into a first list that contains Java™ class names associated with the first release of Java™ byte code, and the target input into a second list containing Java™ class names associated with the second release of the Java™ byte code *(see Figure 20A: 1535 and 1545; Column 14: 14-15, "An API definition file defines the context of a binary file in relationship to other referenced binary files.")*;

- finding matching class names between the first list and the second list, and loading classes corresponding to the matching class names *(see Figure 2; Column 4: 1-10, "In the JVM, the loading step retrieves the class file representing the desired class."; Column 5: 23-27, "When the binary file 60 is referenced by an application executing on a virtual machine 65, a loader 70 loads the binary file 60. A verifier 75 verifies the binary file 60 at some point prior to execution by an interpreter 80."; Column 25: 44-48, "If the set of classes and interfaces defined in the old API definition file is not found in the new API definition file ...")*; and

- comparing the loaded classes to identify APIs that have been modified between the first release of Java™ byte code and the second release of the Java™ byte code, wherein an API has not been modified in case that it maintains a same name, parameter order, parameter types and return types in both the first release of the Java™ byte code and the second release of the Java™ byte code *(see Figure 2; Column 25: 50-53, "... the class and interface attributes are* *compared to the attributes of the same class or interface in the new package. The attributes may include the name, flags, number of fields and number of methods."; Column 26: 1-10, "At 1650, for each field in the old package, the attributes are compared to the same field in the new package. The attributes may include the name, flags and type." and "At 1655, for each method in the old package, the attributes are compared to the same method in the new package. The attributes may include the name, flags and signature.").*

However, Schwabe does not disclose:

- removing the matching class names from the first list and the second list after the comparing, wherein any class names remaining in the first list represent APIs that have been removed for the second release of the Java™ byte code, and wherein any class names remaining in the second list represent APIs that have been added for the second release of the Java™ byte code.

Judge discloses:

- removing the matching class names from the first list and the second list after the comparing, wherein any class names remaining in the first list represent APIs that have been removed for the second release of the Java™ byte code, and wherein any class names remaining in the second list represent APIs that have been added for the second release of the Java™ byte code *(see Column 4: 63-67 through Column 5: 1-5, "Method unloadDataClass unloads a data class by the name of "dataName" by removing the data class object and all instances of the data class object from the data cache 54. Upon removal of a data class object from the data cache 54, the name of the data class "dataName" is also removed from the data class list 47 maintained by Data Manager 48.").*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Judge into the teaching of Schwabe to include removing the matching class names from the first list and the second list after the comparing, wherein any class names remaining in the first list represent APIs that have been removed for the second release of the Java™ byte code, and wherein any class names remaining in the second list represent APIs that have been added for the second release of the Java™ byte code. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to determine differences between two data lists.

As per **Claim 2**, the rejection of **Claim 1** is incorporated; and Schwabe further discloses:

- outputting a report identifying at least one of the APIs that have been modified, the APIs that have been removed and the APIs that have been added *(see Column 25: 44-67 through Column 26: 1-10, "... a verification error is indicated.")*.

As per **Claim 3**, the rejection of **Claim 1** is incorporated; and Schwabe further discloses:

- wherein the loading step comprises loading at least one Java™ class of the first release of Java™ byte code and at least one Java™ class of the second release of the Java™ byte code *(see Column 4: 1-10, "In the JVM, the loading step retrieves the class file representing the desired class.")*.

As per **Claim 4**, the rejection of **Claim 3** is incorporated; and Schwabe further discloses:

- listing methods of the at least one Java™ class of the first release of Java™ byte code in the first list, and listing methods of the at least one Java™ class of the second release of the Java™ byte code in the second list *(see Column 26: 6-10, "At 1655, for each method in the old package, the attributes are compared to the same method in the new package. The attributes may include the name, flags and signature.").*

As per **Claim 5**, the rejection of **Claim 4** is incorporated; and Schwabe further discloses:

- wherein the comparing step comprises comparing the methods in the first list to the methods in the second list to identify APIs that have been modified between the first release of Java™ byte code and the second release of the Java™ byte code *(see Column 25: 50-53, "... the class and interface attributes are compared to the attributes of the same class or interface in the new package. The attributes may include the name, flags, number of fields and number of methods.").*

As per **Claim 6**, the rejection of **Claim 5** is incorporated; however, Schwabe does not disclose:

- wherein the removing step comprises removing, from the first list and the second list, any methods in the first list that are identical to methods in the second list based on the comparison, wherein any methods remaining in the first list after the removing represent APIs that have been removed for the second release of the Java™ byte code, and wherein any methods remaining in the second list after the removing represent APIs that have been added for the second release of the Java™ byte code.

Judge discloses:

- wherein the removing step comprises removing, from the first list and the second list, any methods in the first list that are identical to methods in the second list based on the comparison, wherein any methods remaining in the first list after the removing represent APIs that have been removed for the second release of the Java™ byte code, and wherein any methods remaining in the second list after the removing represent APIs that have been added for the second release of the Java™ byte code *(see Column 4: 63-67 through Column 5: 1-5, "Method unloadDataClass unloads a data class by the name of "dataName" by removing the data class object and all instances of the data class object from the data cache 54. Upon removal of a data class object from the data cache 54, the name of the data class "dataName" is also removed from the data class list 47 maintained by Data Manager 48.").*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Judge into the teaching of Schwabe to include wherein the removing step comprises removing, from the first list and the second list, any methods in the first list that are identical to methods in the second list based on the comparison, wherein any methods remaining in the first list after the removing represent APIs that have been removed for the second release of the Java™ byte code, and wherein any methods remaining in the second list after the removing represent APIs that have been added for the second release of the Java™ byte code. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to determine differences between two data lists.

As per **Claim 8**, the rejection of **Claim 1** is incorporated; and Schwabe further discloses:

- wherein the source input and the target input comprise a list of classes *(see Column 22: 56-58, "A library or applet package (herein referred to as a binary file) is received (1460) ...")*.

Claims 10-15 and 17 are system claims corresponding to the method claims above (Claims 1-6 and 8) and, therefore, are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of Claims 1-6 and 8.

Claims 19-24 and 26 are program product claims corresponding to the method claims above (Claims 1-6 and 8) and, therefore, are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of Claims 1-6 and 8.

15. **Claims 7, 9, 16, 18, 25, and 27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Schwabe** in view of **Judge** as applied to Claims 1, 10, and 19 above, and further in view of **US 6,385,722 (hereinafter "Connelly")**.

As per **Claim 7**, the rejection of **Claim 1** is incorporated; however, Schwabe and Judge do not disclose:

- wherein the source input and the target input comprise JAR files.

Connelly discloses:

- wherein the source input and the target input comprise JAR files *(see Column 1: 14-17, "Software vendors typically ship their products as a set of shared libraries, such as libraries* *written in the Java™ object-oriented programming language and packaged as a conventional shared library file called a JAR file.").*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Connelly into the teaching of Schwabe to include wherein the source input and the target input comprise JAR files. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to easily and efficiently share and use these library files *(see Connelly – Column 1: 17-20).*

Claims 16 and 25 are rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of Claim 7.

As per **Claim 9**, the rejection of **Claim 1** is incorporated; however, Schwabe and Judge do not disclose:

- inputting class paths common to the first release of Java™ byte code and the second release of the Java™ byte code.

Connelly discloses:

- inputting class paths common to the first release of Java™ byte code and the second release of the Java™ byte code *(see Column 7: 46-48, "... the class java.net.URLClassLoader is used as class loader 122 to load classes and resources from a class path of JAR files and directory URLs.").*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Connelly into the teaching of Schwabe to include inputting class paths common to the first release of Java™ byte code and the second release of the Java™ byte code. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to access the parts of shared libraries *(see Connelly – Column 1: 31-34).*

Claims 18 and 27 are rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of Claim 9.

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments filed on August 4, 2008 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

In the Remarks, Applicant argues:

a) The Office has asserted that claims 1-27 are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Office objects to use of the word "JAVA" in the claims. Applicant respectfully submits that "...The presence of a trademark or trade name in a claim is not, per se, improper under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph..." MPEP 2173.05(u). To this extent, the MPEP does not strictly forbid the use of trademarks in the claims, but rather only those which are not "...sufficiently precise and definite." MPEP §608.01(v). Applicant asserts that in the word JAVA, in the context of the claimed invention, refers to an environment within which the invention functions and/or a framework that defines the structure of the constructs of the invention, and not simply a source of goods. To this extent, the term JAVA has a definite meaning, and its use in the claims is permitted.

Examiner's response:

a) Examiner disagrees. With respect to the Applicant's assertion that the trademark JAVA has a definite meaning, and its use in the claims is permitted, the Examiner respectfully submits the relevant portions of MPEP §§ 608.01(v) and 2173.05(u) with emphasis added for purposes of convenience in discussion and illustration:

> **MPEP § 608.01(v) Trademarks and Names Used in Trade**
>
> **I. TRADEMARKS**
>
> **The relationship between a trademark and the product it identifies is sometimes indefinite, uncertain, and arbitrary.** The formula or characteristics of the product may change from time to time and yet it may continue to be sold under the same trademark. **In patent specifications, every element or ingredient of the product should be set forth in positive, exact, intelligible language, so that there will be no uncertainty as to what is meant.** Arbitrary trademarks which are liable to mean different things at the pleasure of manufacturers do not constitute such language. *Ex Parte Kattwinkle*, 12 USPQ 11 (Bd. App. 1931).
>
> **MPEP § 2173.05(u) Trademarks or Trade Names in a Claim**
> **The presence of a trademark or trade name in a claim is not, *per se*, improper under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, but the claim should be carefully analyzed to determine how the mark or name is used in the claim. It is important to recognize that a trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name.** See definitions of trademark and trade name in MPEP § 608.01(v). A list of some trademarks is found in Appendix I.
>
> **If the trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.** *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. In fact, the value of a trademark would be lost to the extent that it became descriptive of a product, rather than used as an identification of a

> source or origin of a product. Thus, the use of a trademark or trade name in a claim to identify or describe a material or product would not only render a claim indefinite, but would also constitute an improper use of the trademark or trade name.
>
> If a trademark or trade name appears in a claim and is not intended as a limitation in the claim, the question of why it is in the claim should be addressed. Does its presence in the claim cause confusion as to the scope of the claim? If so, the claim should be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

According to MPEP § 2173.05(u) provided above and as previously pointed out in the Final Rejection (mailed on 05/02/2008) and further clarified hereinafter, the Examiner respectfully submits that if the trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. *Id.* The trademark JAVA is used in the claims to describe a particular programming language. It refers to a specific product that is proprietary to Sun Microsystems. When a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. *Id.* A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, the use of a trademark or trade name in a claim to identify or describe a material or product would not only render a claim indefinite, but would also constitute an improper use of the trademark or trade name. *Id.* Furthermore, MPEP § 608.01(v) provides guidelines on the use of trademarks in patent specifications and thus, does not pertain to the use of trademarks in the claims.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing analysis, the rejections made under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, with respect to Claims 1-27 are proper and therefore, maintained.

In the Remarks, Applicant argues:

b) With regard to the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections over Schwabe in view of Judge, Applicant asserts that the references cited by the Office do not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to newly amended independent claims 1, 10 and 19, Applicant submits that the cited references fail to teach or suggest comparing the loaded classes to identify APIs that have been modified between the first release of Java byte code and the second release of the Java byte code, wherein an API has not been modified in case that it maintains a same name, parameter order, parameter types and return types in both the first release of the Java byte code and the second release of the Java byte code. Instead, in the passage of Schwabe cited by the Office, it is the API definition files that are compared and not loaded classes. Rather, as stated elsewhere herein, Schwabe teaches against comparing of loaded classes, but only compares the definition files. Furthermore, neither of the references teaches or suggests the exact comparison of the claimed invention.

Examiner's response:

b) Examiner disagrees. With respect to the Applicant's assertion that the cited references fail to teach or suggest comparing the loaded classes to identify APIs that have been modified between the first release of Java byte code and the second release of the Java byte code, wherein an API has not been modified in case that it maintains a same name, parameter order, parameter types and return types in both the first release of the Java byte code and the second release of the Java byte code, the Examiner respectfully submits that Schwabe clearly discloses "comparing the loaded classes to identify APIs that have been modified between the first release of Java byte code and the second release of the Java byte code, wherein an API has not been modified in case that it maintains a same name, parameter order, parameter types and return types in both the first release of the Java byte code and the second release of the Java byte code" *(see Figure 2; Column 25: 50-53, "... the class and interface attributes are compared to the attributes of the same class or interface in the new package. The attributes may include the name, flags, number of fields and number of methods."; Column 26: 1-10, "At 1650, for each field in the old package, the attributes are compared to the same field in the new package. The attributes may include the name, flags and type." and "At 1655, for each method in the old package, the attributes are compared to the same method in the new package. The attributes may include the name, flags and signature.").*

In the Remarks, Applicant argues:

c) With further respect to independent claims 1, 10 and 19, Applicant continues to submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest finding matching class names between the first list and the second list, and loading classes corresponding to the matching class names. Rather, the passages in Schwabe refer to different functions of Schwabe that are completely unrelated. The first passage of Schwabe cited by the Office mentions comparing the set of classes and interfaces in an old API definition file with those in a new API definition file. The second passage references loading of class files. However, the passages in Schwabe cited by the Office do not disclose that the loading of the class files that are loaded are of class files that are derived from the matching. In fact, Schwabe does not even indicate that the class files that are loaded are taken from its API definition files. Rather, Schwabe expressly teaches that

> …verification does not continue beyond an API definition file. This differs from typical verification methods that continue the verification process into an implementation of the API definition file. Col. 14, lines 10-13.

To this extent, Schwabe teaches against the loading of classes based on results from an API definition file verification in its verification process. This is in contrast to the claimed invention in which the classes that are loaded correspond to the matching class names between the first list and the second list. For the above reasons, the separate comparing and loading of Schwabe does not teach or suggest the loading based on the matching of the claimed invention. Judge does not cure this deficiency.

Examiner's response:

c) Examiner disagrees. Applicant's arguments are not persuasive for at least the following reasons:

First, with respect to the Applicant's assertion that the cited passages in Schwabe refer to different functions that are completely unrelated, as previously pointed out in the Final Rejection (mailed on 05/02/2008) and further clarified hereinafter, the Examiner respectfully submits that, in the drawing figure and passages cited by the Examiner, Schwabe describes class loading and verification in the JVM, which is well-known to those of ordinary skill in the art. In the JVM, a loader loads a class file prior to a verifier verifies it. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily comprehend that loading of class files occurs first in the JVM and then, the verifier verifies the loaded class files. Therefore, the loading process and the verification process are related processes in the JVM.

Second, with respect to the Applicant's assertion that Schwabe does not teach nor suggest the loading based on the matching of the claimed invention, as previously pointed out in the Final Rejection (mailed on 05/02/2008) and further clarified hereinafter, the Examiner respectfully submits that Schwabe clearly discloses "loading classes corresponding to the matching class names" *(see Figure 2; Column 4: 1-10, "In the JVM, the loading step retrieves the class file representing the desired class."; Column 5: 23-27, "When the binary file 60 is referenced by an application executing on a virtual machine 65, a loader 70 loads the binary file 60. A verifier 75 verifies the binary file 60 at some point prior to execution by an interpreter 80.")*. Note that, as clarified hereinabove, the verification process occurs after a class file is loaded. Thus, after matching the set of classes and interfaces between the old API definition file and the new API definition file occurs, the matching set of classes and interfaces are loaded to be verified by the verifier.

Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, the rejections made under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) with respect to Claims 1, 10, and 19 are proper and therefore, maintained.

Conclusion

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Qing Chen whose telephone number is 571-270-1071. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM. The Examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen, can be reached on 571-272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Q. C./

Examiner, Art Unit 2191

/Wei Y Zhen/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2191